all the drawings in the Committee-room is Sir James Thornhill's design for the ceiling of the Painted Hall; though it is but on a small scale, and merely a pen and sepia sketch, yet it is very effective, and shews much judgment in the execution: I need not here enter into a detail of the subject of this sketch, as it is familiar to all the sight-seeing visitors of Greenwich, who invariably take a turn into the Painted Hall. There are two other little sketches by Thornhill, one representing himself explaining the design to the Prince of Wales, and the other, Sir S. Jennings shewing a plan of the Hospital to the same party. From this sketch we are able to trace the portrait of the painter, which is introduced in the bottom corner of the painting at the extreme end of the hall.

There are two other drawings in the room, being designs for the sculpture of the tympanum of two pediments, but where these pediments are I had not time to ascertain; there are also two ancient views of Greenwich, copied from drawings in the Bodleian Library. All the above drawings are merely pen sketches, slightly tinted in with sepia, with here and there a little blue to heighten the effect; some of them are very good, but others want that fine fiery spirit and energy which we always expect to see in the works of a master.

There are also two or three oil-colour views of the baronial residence of the unfortunate Earl of Derwentwater, whose life was forfeited along with his estates, at the termination of the "old Pretender's" rebellion. The estates, I believe, now form part of the College property, which, I suppose, accounts for these paintings being here.

I am very much pleased to find that these drawings are so carefully preserved, but I will venture to suggest that the sketches of Thornhill ought to be placed in the Painted Hall, say in the dais, especially as they exclusively relate to the painting of the hall itself.

I am, Sir, &c.

Joseph Lockwood, Surveyor, &c.

32, Lime-street, City.

### LEEDS NEW GAOL COMPETITION.

Sir,—In reply to the Inquiry of "H." in the last Builder, I supply the information which he seeks.

The first premium has been awarded to Messrs. Hurst and Moffatt, of Doncaster, and the second premium to Messrs. Perkin and Backhouse, of Leeds; the former of these parties sent in three sets of plans, two of which are to be combined to make one.

The plans selected for adoption are quite different from the model plans prepared by Major Jebb, which accompanied the "Instructions to Architects." Most of the competitors followed that plan, but Messrs. Hurst and Moffatt have made all the wings to radiate from the central building, and in this consists the superiority.

Some parties think it questionable whether the committee have acted fairly in giving the premium to a plan the arrangements of which are at variance with the lithographed plans furnished for the guidance of competitors, and it is also questionable whether the plans of Messrs. Hurst and Moffatt were entitled to either premium, as no detailed estimate was furnished of the masons' work and brickwork, although the "Instructions" required that all designs should be accompanied by an "*estimate in detail*" of the cost.

A Subscriber.

September 20, 1843.

### MEASURING AND VALUING.

Sir,—Having seen your notice of a new work entitled "The Students' Guide to the Art of Measuring," I was induced to purchase it, and, like your correspondent J. D., find that it is far from being complete. Though there is a great deal of practical experience embodied in it which could not have been collected without considerable labour and expense, still I think if you or some of your elder readers who have been in the habit of measuring the various works executed connected with buildings, and in taking quantities, would supply the deficiencies, it would be of infinite service to some of your student readers. For instance, the method of measuring plumbers' work is entirely omitted. And in the smiths' work the student would but poorly succeed in taking the quantities of cast-iron columns, bressummers, girders, &c., from the information given under that head. And as there is a great difference in the mode of measuring brickwork here to what is laid down in this work, perhaps it will add to the information of some of your readers if I were to state the method usually practised, which is by ordering all brickwork to a standard of 1 brick length thick (or 9 inches), and brought into superficial square yards, the openings being deducted, and labour charged extra to door and window jambs for plumbings, &c. The flues are not measured (except from the attic ceiling line to the top of chimney-shaft, which is taken as solid), but charged for work and material at so much per flue, averaging the height of the stories. The method given of abstracting quantities I think quite unnecessary and attended with considerable trouble and loss of time. If in taking quantities each kind of work is kept under its proper head and proceeded with in order, they can be at once copied into the bill when squared.

Hoping this may find a place in your valuable journal,

I remain yours,

H. B.

Liverpool, September 19, 1843.

### NORMAN ARCHITECTURE—HEREFORD CATHEDRAL.

Sir,—I will readily allow that the *clerestory* of the compartment of Hereford Cathedral (page 377) ought to be dated 50 or even 80 years later than the two lower stories, but as I could not well detach the upper from the lower part, I suffered it to remain, thinking that any one moderately acquainted with Norman architecture would be able to see the difference between the upper and lower parts; however, as C. thinks that all of it ought to be 50 years later, I will endeavour to convince him by respectable authorities that he is wrong. In Britton's account of Hereford Cathedral the date is 1107; this of course is intended only for the lower parts; knowing Britton's general accuracy in regard to dates, this ought to be sufficient to convince any body; but I will bring another respected antiquary, the Rev. J. Dallaway, who shall settle the question. In the "Discourses" he mentions this part of the cathedral as being built by Robert de Losinge, date 1079-1095; I think this is enough to satisfy C., or any body else.

I may perhaps be allowed to remark further, that the groining of Norwich and the clerestory and groining of Gloucester Cathedrals is considerably later than the Norman period; but I should not have considered it necessary to have remarked this but for the notice from C.

As some atonement for the barrenness of the foregoing remarks, allow me to conclude by appending the following table of the various classifications of the styles of ecclesiastical English architecture. From this table it will be seen that not one of these antiquaries agree with the other as to the time a style lasted, or when it came in and when it went out; I do not pretend to offer an opinion as to which is right, for "Who shall decide when doctors disagree?"

TABLE OF THE VARIOUS CLASSIFICATIONS OF THE STYLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL ENGLISH ARCHITECTURE.

| NAME OF AUTHOR. | STYLES OF ARCHITECTURE. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Norman. | | Early English. | | Decorated English. | | Perpendicular. | | | | | | | |
| Rickman | 1066-1189 | Norman. | 1189-1307 | Early English. | 1307-1377 | Decorated English. | 1377-1546 | Perpendicular. | | | | | | |
| Civil Engineer and Architects' Journal. | 1000-1130 | First Period. Before and to 1100 | 1200-1250 | Second Period. 1100-1250 | 1300-1360 | Ornamental English. 1300-1460 | 1400-1550 | Florid. 1460-1637 | | | | | | |
| Millars | 1066-1200 | Anglo-Norman. 1066-1189 | 1200-1300 | English. 1189-1272 | 1250-1300 | Third Period. 1250-1400 | 1400-1600 | Fourth Period. 1400-1600 | | | | | | |
| Adey Repton | 1066-1189 | Anglo-Norman. | 1189-1307 | Lancet Arch Gothic. 1200-1300 | 1300-1400 | Decorated English. 1272-1461 | 1461-1509 | Florid English. 1461-1509 | | | | | | |
| Britton | 1100-1170 | Semi-Norman. | 1170-1220 | Early English. | 1220-1307 | Decorated English. | 1307-1377 | Perpendicular. | 1377-1546 | Tudor Style, or Florid Gothic. | 1460-1550 | | | |
| Dallaway | | | | | | Transition Style, or Pure Gothic. | 1300-1400 | | | | | | | |

I remain, Mr. Editor, yours obediently,

J. L. C.

### IN RE BRITISH MUSEUM.

Sir,—A letter having appeared the other day in the *Morning Herald*, wherein the writer stated that the model for the intended façade of the British Museum might now be seen by the public, and was attracting a number of artists, I lost no time in repairing thither, but found there was no truth in the report.

I ascertained, indeed, that there was such a model in the building, and it has probably been there for many years; but it was not allowed to be seen, except by a written order from Sir R. Smirke himself, therefore is no more accessible to artists or the public than Sir Robert's own house, which last he would perhaps much more readily shew, upon application being made for such favour, than the model of his design for the front of the Museum.

One thing, however, I did see, which is that the south-west angle of the new portion is begun and rapidly advancing, therefore within a short time such progress will have been made as will entirely frustrate all attempt to set aside the present design for one that shall be more worthy of the occasion.

Though it must be confessed that the matter has not been taken up as it ought to be, that the public press has, with few exceptions, carefully avoided touching upon it, and that no one of influence and authority in the world of art, and among those who pretend to watch over its interests, has come forward on this important occasion,—notwithstanding all this, it cannot be hereafter said that no warning voice was raised in time to avert mischief, no anxiety expressed in any quarter.

Has not the British Museum a single sincere friend who can manfully step forward to its rescue even now? Are its own trustees, are the patrons of art, nobles and commoners alike, one and all asleep? or are they one and all indifferent and faithless? If they be only slumbering, they are likely to be awakened very disagreeably when the voice of the country shall pronounce the National Museum of Britain to be a national disgrace as a production of architecture.

I remain, yours, &c.,

Vindicator.

### ORMSKIRK CHURCH.

Sir,—Perhaps you will permit me to correct your account of the church at Ormskirk (13 miles from Liverpool), as given in the last Builder. There is a tale told in that town similar to the one you have related; it is also given in Baines' "History of Lancashire," but no person who examines the spire and the tower will, I think, say they were built in the same age. The spire is very early perpendicular in style, about 1380 to 1440, and appears to be the oldest part of the church now standing. The tower is quite different in style, and has to all appearance been erected since the Reformation. Baines says, "A more probable tradition is, that the tower was built after the suppression of the monasteries, for the reception of the eight bells from Burscough Priory. In a chapel within the church of Ormskirk is the cemetery of the Derby family, being a vault, the descent to which is closed by folding doors; and here the dust of that illustrious race has been deposited every since the dissolution of the priory at Burscough, at which period the bodies of the deceased Stanleys, not then reduced to ashes, were brought to this place. The chapel and cemetery were erected under the direction of the will of Edward, the third Earl of Derby, dated in 1572. This nobleman died at Lathom House on Friday, the 24th of October, 1574."

In the "Valor Beneficiorum," taken in 1291, Ormeschirche, a vicarage, is valued at 13*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* Leland, when mentioning the church in his "Itinerary," does not state the circumstance of its having two steeples. There is an inscription on a brass plate in the north wall, bearing date 1661, whereby Henry Mosoke avers that his ancestors have been buried here 385 years.

Your obedient servant,

T. H. C.

Ruthin, 20th September, 1843.

### ON TAKING STAINS OUT OF MARBLE.

Sir,—I see by The Builder of yesterday an excellent recipe for taking stains out of marble; it is one that I have many times made use of, and in many instances with success. By making the following addition to it, I have found it still more efficacious in removing all stains (iron-moulds excepted): After removing the ingredients, the lime and the American ash, lay on a coat of good fresh plaster, say half-an-inch thick; put the work before a brisk fire, or hold a hot iron over the plaster at a sufficient distance from the marble as not to injure it. Get the plaster hot, let it remain on the marble a few hours, remove it, and in nine cases out of ten the stain will have disappeared. Should it fail to produce the desired effect, by repeating the process, success will be the result. The American potash and lime, as proposed by your correspondent "Z," will remove old paint, though twenty coats should have been put one upon another. It is necessary that real American ash should be used; it may be known by its being of a granular appearance, something like common sago.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

Leicester, September 24, 1843. W. L.

To learn more about OCR and PDF Compression go to ThePaperlessOffice.org